Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,807
Docket No.: 10932-US-PA

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Final Office Action mailed May 3, 2007. Claims 1-4 are pending and remained unchanged, as originally filed. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-4 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action was made final while maintaining the rejection made to claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Yamazaki (US 2003/0146888).

In response to the rejections thereto, Applicants hereby otherwise traverse the rejections. As such, Applicants insist that claims 1-4 are novel and unobvious over AAPA and Yamazaki, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed.

In the current final Office Action and the immediate previous non-final Office Action, the Examiner had admitted that the AAPA fails to teach that the absolute value of the threshold voltage of the second transistor is between 2.5V to 3.5V (See Page 3, first paragraph of the current Office Action). The Examiner then cited Yamazaki as a second reference and contended: "[Y]amazaki teaches that P-type transistors can be operated using a threshold voltage with an absolute value of 2.5V to 3.5V", relying on which the Examiner believed "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,807
Docket No.: 10932-US-PA

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding Final Office Action mailed May 3, 2007. Claims 1-4 are pending and remained unchanged, as originally filed. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-4 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Office Action was made final while maintaining the rejection made to claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter AAPA) in view of Yamazaki (US 2003/0146888).

In response to the rejections thereto, Applicants hereby otherwise traverse the rejections. As such, Applicants insist that claims 1-4 are novel and unobvious over AAPA and Yamazaki, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and should be allowed.

In the current final Office Action and the immediate previous non-final Office Action, the Examiner had admitted that the AAPA fails to teach that the absolute value of the threshold voltage of the second transistor is between 2.5V to 3.5V (See Page 3, first paragraph of the current Office Action). The Examiner then cited Yamazaki as a second reference and contended: "[Y]amazaki teaches that P-type transistors can be operated using a threshold voltage with an absolute value of 2.5V to 3.5V", relying on which the Examiner believed "[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

said threshold voltage of said second transistor is between 2V to 5V" is definitely intrinsic to the reason of Yamazaki for employing such a transistor in his invention. Further, still a further important issues to be considered is should one of ordinary skill in the art believe the motivation or reason alleged by the Examiner that is "[i]n order allow for both constant voltage drive and constant current drive in an OLED display and to allow the display to compensate for the different characteristics of OLED materials according to color" could be achieved.

Applicants disagree with that Yamazaki has taught his invention and mentioned a P-type transistor that could be operated using with a threshold with an absolute value of 2.5 to 3.5. Yamazaki teaches a threshold voltage Vth is given as -2V (Yamazaki, Pg. 5, [0095]), and Yamazaki does not teach a P-type transistor that could be operated using with a threshold with an absolute value of 2.5 to 3.5 can bring advantages of "[a]llow for both constant voltage drive and constant current drive in an OLED display and allow the display to compensate for the different characteristics of OLED materials according to color" to any OLED display.

Therefore, with all the teachings provided by Yamazaki, it should be understood to those having ordinary skill in the art that merely putting such a specific transistor in an OLED display or merely replacing a transistor of the display with such a specific transistor would not likely to achieve the advantages or objects of Yamazaki.

As such, there is no motivation for those of ordinary skill in the art to use the P-type transistor of Yamazaki in place f the second transistor as taught by the AAPA.

For lack of motivation to modify the AAPA with the teaching of Yamazaki, Applicants submit claims 1-4 are novel and unobvious over the AAPA, Yamazaki, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/605,807
Docket No.: 10932-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-4 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date : July 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw